

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Inventors: Sebastien Perrot, et al.
Application No.: 10/660,141
Confirmation No.: 4968
Filed: September 11, 2003
Title: **DEVICE FOR CONNECTING A WIRELESS
NETWORK TO AT LEAST ONE OTHER NETWORK**
Examiner: Addy, Anthony S.
Art Unit: 2617

Mail Stop **APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

The Appellants hereby submit this Notice of Appeal and Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, on appeal from the decision of the Examiner dated 7 April 2010 rejecting Claims 2-10. Please apply the fees previously paid for an appeal and brief to the instant Appeal and Brief. The Appellants hereby petition for a two-month extension of the period for response to the open rejection. Please charge the fee for this extension to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted on _____ to
Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Fax
No. (571) 273-8300 on:

Date

Signature

Table of Contents

| <u>Appeal Brief Section</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| Real Party in Interest | 3 |
| Related Appeals and Interferences | 4 |
| Status of Claims | 5 |
| Status of Amendments | 6 |
| Summary of Claimed Subject Matter | 7 |
| Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal | 8 |
| Remarks/Arguments | 9 |
| Claims Appendix | 12 |
| Evidence Appendix | 14 |
| Related Proceedings Appendix | 15 |

Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is:

THOMSON LICENSING S.A.,
46 Quai A. LeGallo
F-92100 Boulogne Billancourt
France,

the assignee of the entire right, title and interest in and to the subject
application, by virtue of an assignment recorded with the US Patent and Trademark
Office on 16 February 2004, at Reel/Frame 014340/0560.

Related Appeals and Interferences

A previous appeal was filed on 21 July 2010, which resulted in reopening of prosecution. The Appellants assert that no other appeals or interferences are known to the Appellants, the Appellants' legal representatives or assignee, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of Claims

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Claims 2-10, all of the remaining Claims in the application, have been rejected. The rejection of Claims 2-10 is appealed.

Status of Amendments

All submitted amendments have been entered.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The following sets forth independent Claim 10, with parenthesized references to the instant specification and drawing:

10. Device for connecting a centralized wireless network (201, ¶0025) to at least one other network (207, ¶0025), said device being a wireless station compliant to the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards (¶0023), and further comprising:

a wireless interface (203, ¶0029) for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of said centralized wireless network, wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards (¶0023);

a bridge module (301, ¶0029) for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective networks; and

a link management module (302, ¶0029) for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized wireless network such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point (¶0027).

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether Claims 2 and 10 are patentable under 35 USC 103(e) over US 6,400,702 to Meier in view of US 7,099,295 to Doyle et al..
2. Whether Claims 3-9 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Meier in view of Doyle et al and US 5,570,366 to Baker et al.

Remarks/Arguments

This invention relates to a device for connecting a centralized wireless network to another network, in which the device is compliant with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards. As pointed out in ¶'s 0002 and 0007 of the instant specification, according to these standards, only one access point is allowed per wireless basic service set. It is therefore impossible to use a wireless network of this type to act as a backbone for connecting to other networks. The instant invention solves this problem by providing a bridge module and a link management module, such that devices connected to another network will appear as wireless stations to the access point. Compliance with the standards is maintained.

1. Cited US 6,400,702 to Meier relates to a network which complies with IEEE 802.3. See column 3, lines 27-29. Meier uses multiple access points 107, 112, 113, 114 and 115. See column 20, lines 10-12. It is therefore clear, and the Examiner appears to agree, that Meier does not comply with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards.

Nowhere does Meier show or suggest:

“said device being a wireless station compliant to IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 10.

Doyle et al relates to an apparatus for bridging between a wired network and two wireless networks. The bridge apparatus comprises a first radio interface 116 to an IEEE 802.11 standard wireless network, and a second radio interface 118 to a non- IEEE 802.11 network, as indicated in column 7, lines 3-9. In a first mode, the bridge behaves as an access point; in a second mode, the bridge behaves as a base station, as set forth in column 7, lines 37-51. Nowhere does Doyle et al show or suggest the bridge acting as an 802.11 wireless station. It is therefore clear that Doyle et al does not show or suggest:

“a link management module for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized wireless network such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 10. It is therefore clear that even if Meier were to be combined with Doyle et al., the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected.

Claim 2 is dependent from Claim 10, and adds further advantageous features. The Appellants submit that dependent Claim 2 is patentable as its parent Claim 10.

2. The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-9 as unpatentable over Meier in view of Doyle et al. and US 5,570,366 to Baker et al. Baker et al relates to a device for preventing transmissions to a wireless network that will not be responded to by a receiving terminal. See column 2, lines 25-29. Since Baker et al use multiple access points, as shown in Figures 3 and 4, it is clear that Baker et al does not comply with IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan 2 standards. It is therefore clear that even if Meier were to be combined with Doyle et al. and of Baker et al, the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected. Since Claims 3-9 are dependent from Claim 10 and add further advantageous features, the Appellants submit that dependent Claims 3-9 are patentable as their parent Claim 10.

The Appellants therefore submit that the open rejection is improper and should be reversed. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Sebastien Perrot et al.

by: _____/Catherine A. Cooper/_____

Catherine A. Cooper, attorney
Reg. No. 40,877
Tel. No. (609) 734-6440

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
2 Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
Date: ___August 24, 2010_____

Claims Appendix

1. (cancelled)
2. Device according to claim 10, further comprising means for determining a spanning tree for all networks attached to the device, comprising means for enabling or disabling the determination of the spanning tree.
3. Device according to claim 10, further comprising means for updating filtering tables for respective connected networks, said filtering tables comprising information for determining whether a message on a network is to be forwarded to another network, said updating using a process by default, comprising means for enabling or disabling the default process.
4. Device according to claim 3, wherein said default process is based on analysis of source addresses in messages detected on a respective network, comprising means for enabling or disabling message detection based updating.
5. Device according to claim 3, further comprising means for updating a filtering table for a given network based on a device discovery process specific to said given network.
6. Device according to claim 3, wherein said default process is enabled for an Ethernet network.
7. Device according to claim 3, wherein said default process is disabled for a USB network.

8. Device according to claim 10, further comprising means for generating a message to said link management module upon a filtering table amendment, said means for generating having an enabled state and a disabled state for each network.

9. Device according to claim 8, wherein said means for generating a message is enabled for an Ethernet network.

10. Device for connecting a centralized wireless network to at least one other network, said device being a wireless station compliant to the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards, and further comprising:

a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of said centralized wireless network, wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards;

a bridge module for managing a plurality of ports for connecting to respective networks; and

a link management module for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized wireless network such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point.

Serial No. 10/660,141
Customer No. 24498

PF030065

Evidence Appendix

None

Related Proceedings Appendix

A previous appeal and brief were filed on 21 January 2010. Such previous appeal and brief resulted in reopening of prosecution. Otherwise, there are no related proceedings.